



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

was a fair show of generosity. The Romanists have a right to their views about the sanctity of consecrated soil. We respect them for honoring their conviction, but we have no respect for the camouflage of weak Protestants or wily Romanists. This weakening of conviction in some Protestants is a great danger in the present pressure of Romanism.

RECEPTIONS FOR THE SERVICE MEN

THE length of time required to bring our armies home has made necessary the postponing of any general receptions to the boys who have been in service. This has its unfortunate feature, for the time one appreciates reception is when he first arrives after an absence from home. At that time only personal and family receptions were possible, so many had not yet arrived. True, in some places special receptions were given earlier by communities and organizations. But now that the head of the American Expeditionary Force has arrived and our boys of that expedition and of the camp service are all home, the day of receptions is here. This is particularly true of the churches. The month of October has been marked by church receptions to the soldiers who were members or associated with churches.

We honor the professional soldier who, in addition to his military prowess and talents, is a Christian and a gentleman. We are quite persuaded that these men are more usually strong Christians than are men devoted to politics. History enrolls among professional soldiers some of the noblest of the race, from Abraham down to the generals of the late war. While we give to these professional men all due honor, yet our largest esteem and affection goes out to those young men who left mother and father, brother and sister, wife and child, and arresting their business, interrupting their life courses and prospects, they took their lives in their hands and went forth to resist the enemy of truth and righteousness and peace, until they should bring him to his knees. The boys, on returning, have not always understood how deep the feeling for them was in all hearts. The present receptions are expressing it, and this is especially true in connection with the churches. We have had the privilege of attending some of these occasions in Philadelphia and vicinity. Among the others, at the Ardmore Presbyterian Church, of which Rev. Edmund G. Rawson is pastor, the men of the church gave a most hearty and successfully conducted reception to the service men connected with the church. The hosts turned out in great numbers, and their cordiality and arrangements were most excellent. The boys responded in goodly numbers, both officers and enlisted men. The evening was in every way most successful, new friendships were formed and new plans were made possible. We were surprised and delighted with the array of splendid manhood in the church.

Another of these receptions we attended at the Northminster Church of Philadelphia, Rev. W. Courtland Robinson, D.D., pastor. Here the whole church, young and old, united in the reception. This church has always been, and now is, fed upon the finest of the wheat and the strongest of the meat of the Word of God, and in these days of fads and fuss their people show solid Christian culture, sound convictions and loyal, unvarnished friendship. An evening spent with them and their

pastor is like a rest in green pastures and beside still waters. Thank God for such churches.

PRIVACY AND PUBLICITY

THERE is a tendency to sensitiveness under the pressure of public utterances. The exposure of private conversation is betrayal. Public utterance belongs to mankind. Wrongly quoted, one should make correction in person or over his signature. Lengthy explanations avail little. If one has over-stated himself, acknowledgment and correction should be made. This brings respect. If he stands by his original utterance, he should take the consequences. This is manly.

THE COURTS AND AGENCIES

WE have recently had our attention called to a session which has organized the elders and deacons into visiting committees. This is no innovation. It is a revival. We have known a number of churches where this has been practiced, and in every case the results were good. In times like these, when all kinds of councils and movements and committees are pre-empting the regular courts and agencies of the church, it is a real relief to know a session with initiative and life and independence sufficient to manage its own affairs and work its own field. We are persuaded that the church will sometime come back to the simplicity of her own courts and agencies, instead of the present complexity of organizations and councils.

ORGANIC UNION OR FEDERATION

SO far as we can learn, *organic union* of the churches, in the sense of merger, for the present has received a quietus. So far as this affects the various members of the Presbyterian family, we regret it, for we have long desired this reunion and have believed it altogether possible. But unless there can be hearty spontaneity in the case, we prefer not to see it attempted. Our experiences consequent upon the Cumberland Union are enough of that kind of thing. The effort now is for federation. This is still indefinite. The plans are not yet matured. Some call it organic. We question the right of this term in this connection. The federation is to deal only with administrative work. It will probably be carried on by a council. This may mean the multiplying of small groups outside of the courts, which shall direct and control the affairs of the church. This is not a bright prospect.

We already have a federal union of a number of Protestant churches. This is found in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. There have emanated from this council from time to time doctrinal expressions which would not be generally accepted. It has recently made a social survey, and its report is almost purely economic, and deals altogether with the commercial and economic problems. It pronounces decisions on political economy which many men would declare premature, while it has scarcely a word to say about those great fundamental teachings of the Holy Scriptures, which must underlie all true social and civil relations. If this kind of council is to be greatly multiplied, the church will not rejoice.



∴ Paul on Women Speaking in Church ∴

By Professor Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D.



I HAVE recently received a letter from a valued friend asking me to send him a "discussion of the Greek words *laleo* and *lego* in such passages as I Cor. 14: 33-39, with special reference to the question: Does the thirty-fourth verse forbid all women everywhere to speak or preach publicly in Christian churches?" The matter is of universal interest, and I take the liberty of communicating my reply to the readers of THE PRESBYTERIAN.

It requires to be said at once that there is no problem with reference to the relations of *laleo* and *lego*. Apart from niceties of merely philological interest, these words stand related to one another just as the English words *speak* and *say* do; that is to say, *laleo* expresses the *act of talking*, while *lego* refers to *what is said*. Wherever then the fact of speaking, without reference to the content of what is said, is to be indicated, *laleo* is used, and must be used. There is nothing disparaging in the intimation of the word, any more than there is in our word *talk*; although, of course, it can on occasion be used disparagingly as our word *talk* can also—as when some of the newspapers intimate that the Senate is given over to mere talk. This disparaging application of *laleo*, however, never occurs in the New Testament, although the word is used very frequently.

The word is in its right place in I Cor. 14: 33ff, therefore, and necessarily bears there its simple and natural meaning. If we needed anything to fix its meaning, however, it would be supplied by its frequent use in the preceding part of the chapter, where it refers not only to speaking with tongues (which was a divine manifestation and unintelligible only because of the limitations of the hearers), but also to the prophetic speech, which is directly declared to be to edification and exhortation and comforting (verses 3-6). It would be supplied more pungently, however, by its contrasting term here—"let them be silent" (verse 34). Here we have *laleo* directly defined for us: "Let the women *keep silent*, for it is not permitted to them to *speak*." Keep silent—speak: these are the two opposites; and the one defines the other.

It is important to observe, now, that the pivot on which the injunction of these verses turns, is not the prohibition of speaking so much as the command of silence. That is the main injunction. The prohibition of speech is introduced only to explain the meaning more fully. What Paul says is in brief: "Let the women keep silent in the churches." That surely is direct and specific enough for all needs. He then adds explanatorily: "For it is not permitted to them to speak." "It is not permitted" is an appeal to a general law, valid apart from Paul's personal command, and looks back to the opening phrase—"as in all the churches of the saints." He is only requiring the Corinthian women to conform to the general law of the churches. And that is the meaning of the almost bitter words which he adds in verse 36, in which, reproaching them for the innovation of permitting women to speak in the churches, he reminds them that they are not the au-

thors of the gospel, nor are they its sole possessors—let them keep to the law that binds the whole body of churches and not be seeking some new-fangled way of their own.

The intermediate verses only make it plainer that precisely what the apostle is doing is forbidding women to speak at all in the church. His injunction of silence he pushes so far that he forbids them even to ask questions; and adds with special reference to that, but through that to the general matter, the crisp declaration that "it is indecent"—for that is the meaning of the word—"for a woman to speak in church."

It would be impossible for the apostle to speak more directly or more emphatically than he has done here. He requires women to be silent at the church-meetings. For that is what "in the churches" means. There were no church buildings then. And he has not left us in doubt as to the nature of these church-meetings. He had just described them in verses 26ff. They were of the general character of our prayer-meetings. Note the words, "let him be silent in the church," in verse 30, and compare them with "let them be silent in the churches," in verse 34. The prohibition of women speaking covers thus all public church-meetings—it is the publicity, not the formality of it, which is the point. And he tells us repeatedly that this is the universal law of the church. He does more than that. He tells us that it is the commandment of the Lord, and emphasizes the word "Lord" (verse 37).

The passages in I Tim. 2: 11ff is just as strong, although it is more particularly directed to the specific case of public teaching or ruling in the church. The apostle had already in this context (verse 8, "the men," in contrast with "women" of verse 9) pointedly confined public praying to men, and now continues: "Let a woman learn in silence in all subjection; but I do not permit to the woman to teach, neither to rule over the man, but to be in silence." Neither the teaching nor the ruling function is permitted to woman. The apostle says here, "I do not permit," instead of as in I Cor. 14: 33ff, "it is not permitted," because he is here giving his personal instructions to Timothy, his subordinate, while there he was announcing to the Corinthians the general law of the church. What he instructs Timothy, however, is the general law of the church. And so he goes on and grounds his prohibition in a universal reason which affects the entire race equally.

In the face of these two absolutely plain and emphatic passages, what is said in I Cor. 11: 5 cannot be appealed to in mitigation or modification. Precisely what is meant in I Cor. 11: 5, nobody quite knows. What is said there is that every woman praying or prophesying unveiled dishonors her head. It seems fair to infer that if she prays or prophesies veiled she does not dishonor her head. And it seems fair still further to infer that she may properly pray or prophesy if only she does it veiled. We are piling up a chain of inferences. And they have not carried us very far. We cannot infer that it would be proper for her to pray or prophesy *in church* if only she

were veiled. There is nothing said about church in the passage or in the context. The word "church" does not occur until the 16th verse, and then not as ruling the reference of the passage, but only as supplying support for the injunction of the passage. There is no reason whatever for believing that "praying and prophesying" in church is meant. Neither was an exercise confined to the church. If, as in I Cor. 14: 14, the "praying" spoken of was an ecstatic exercise—as its place by "prophesying" may suggest—then, there would be the divine inspiration superceding all ordinary laws, to be reckoned with. And there has already been occasion to observe that prayer in public is forbidden to women in I Tim. 2: 8, 9. Unless mere *attendance* at prayer is meant, in which case this passage is a close parallel of I Tim. 2: 9.

What then must be noted, in conclusion, is:

(1) That the prohibition of speaking in the church to women is precise, absolute, and all-inclusive. They are to keep silent in the churches—and that means in all the public meetings for worship: they are not even to ask questions; (2) that this prohibition is given especial point precisely for the two matters of teaching and ruling—covering specifically the functions of preaching and ruling elders; (3) that the grounds on which the prohibition is put are universal, and turn on the difference in sex, and particularly on the relative places given to the sexes in creation and in the fundamental history of the race (the fall).

Perhaps it ought to be added in elucidation of the last

point just made, that the difference in conclusions between Paul and the feminist movement of to-day is rooted in a fundamental difference in their points of view relatively to the constitution of the human race. To Paul, the human race is made up of families, and every several organism, the church included, is composed of families, united together by this or that bond. The relation of the sexes in the family follows it therefore into the church. To the feminist movement the human race is made up of individuals; a woman is just another individual by the side of the man; and it can see no reason for any differences in dealing with the two. And, indeed, if we can ignore the great fundamental natural difference of sex, and destroy the great fundamental social unit of the family, in the interest of individualism, there does not seem any reason why we should not wipe out the differences established by Paul between the sexes in the church. Except, of course, the authority of Paul. It all, in the end, comes back to the authority of the apostles, as founders of the church. We may like what Paul says, or we may not like it. We may be willing to do what he commands, or we may not be willing to do it. But there is no room for doubt of what he says. And he certainly would say to us, what he said to the Corinthians: "What? Was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it to you alone?" Is this Christianity ours—to do with as we like? Or is it God's religion, receiving its laws from him through the apostles?



Wisdom



By Rev. David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.



DR. DAVID JAS. BURRELL

WISDOM is more than knowledge; it refers to truth in the province of the spiritual life.

The most important things for us to know are not the final analysis of matter or the distance of the fixed stars, but rather the things which concern our relation to God. We want to know whether there is a God, and whether we ourselves are immortal and whether there is any way of being delivered from the penalty and power of sin. It is in the solution of such problems that we find that wisdom whose "price is above rubies"; and it is precisely here that Christ enlightens us.

He teaches truth; and he alone can speak with authority concerning the problems of the endless life. The agnostic disavows all knowledge of the supernatural. The positivist says: "We can see phenomena, but it is a waste of time to try to account for them." The materialist says: "As to any other world or any hereafter, we can only speculate. We know that we are living here and now, and that is enough. Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."

But here comes Jesus with a philosophy in which "life and immortality are brought to light." We ask him to show us God; and he answers: "Have I been so long time with you; and yet hast thou not known me? He

that hath seen me hath seen the Father. Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" We ask him, "If a man die, will he live again?" and, standing by an open grave, he answers: "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." We ask him if there is any way of being delivered from sin and from the certain fearful-looking of judgment which accompanies it; and he points to the cross, saying, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost and to give his life a ransom for many. He that believeth in him hath everlasting life."

We call ourselves disciples, and, as such, sitting about his feet, and taking him at his word, we solve all such problems as these. It is obvious, therefore, that a man may be very ignorant as the schools count ignorance, and yet be a very wise man. He may know nothing about the stars, but he has discovered the Bright and Morning Star. He may know nothing about metaphysics, but he has found the secret of life.

Men tell me that the day of miracles has passed, but I answer no. Miracles have not ceased. *Faith has ceased.* God offers all things to him who has the faith to claim them. When he said, "Be filled with the Spirit," he simply declared that this was possible. When the will is surrendered he in whose dispensation we live will come in and fill us. And the result is a kind of passive activity, as if one were wrought upon and controlled by some power outside of himself.—J. Wilbur Chapman.

Jet Lights on Jesus

The Theology of Jesus: Its Sallencies and Simplicities

By Rev. S. B. Dunn, D.D.



REV. S. B. DUNN, D.D. He was both seer and surgeon. His lance was as keen as his glance. Jesus *finds* man, and finds man at his deepest.

In the theology of Jesus a new note is, The primacy of the individual. Jesus crowns the unit in the race. Masses and classes are lost in the ones: the one sheep, the one coin, the one son. The eye of Jesus is leveled upon the bull's-eye, the sinning man. The apostles are hand-picked. He fishes with hook and line. In this way he caught Nicodemus and the woman at the well; one throw of the line landed the one, and one whip of the stream won the other. Jesus looks profoundly into this individual man. What he sees beneath man's sinful nature is man's salvability. It is less that man is lost than that man may be found. Man's native nobleness beneath his nature is assumed. The sinner is a potential saint. What makes Jesus, the psychologist, an optimist, is that redemption is in process of realization in his own arrival and commitment to carry it out. "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost," and time and eternity are on his side.

Ringling through the theology of Jesus is that further note of eternity. The world of Jesus is more than the world of men; it is an eternal world, a spiritual world, an infinite world—a cosmos, not a chaos. The fact of sin resounds through this world of Jesus like a summer thunder clap: flashes in forked lightning; but on the very cloud from which the peal rolls and the flash leaps is painted a rainbow of sacrifice for sin and a promise of forgiveness. So by threat and smile, by menace and assurance, Jesus makes the sinner *want* to be saved—that miracle of grace and that pledge of redemption triumphant. He paints the penitent sinner at prayer, with hand on breast and eye on smoking temple-altar, and cry on lips: "God, be propitious through yonder sacrifice to me, the sinner." Hence the saved go out into God's great world to roam at will, manumitted. Luke 4: 18—"He hath sent me . . . to set at liberty," *epheis*, sending away," them that are bound."

Let me bead a few gems of the theology of Jesus in this matter of man.

1. Jesus taught that God is more sensible to the soul of man than to mere human reason. "Truth is descended from conscience," says one. It was this conscience-quality in the Jew that lent fitness and force to the supreme appeal of Jesus; for, as Neander justly remarks, "Conscience was more alive among the Hebrew nation than any other people." God is best known by listening to

the oracle within. Matured truths are revealed to "babes"—a word meaning infants at the breast and not yet able to talk. The child-heart! Fundamental conscience! "With the *heart* man believeth unto *righteousness*."

2. Jesus taught that the mainspring in the mechanism of man is the will. "If any man willet to do . . . he shall know . . ." If he shall sense the divine source of truth and duty; shall feel their authority and worth, the sequel will be a clear vision and an easy action of the soul-machinery: the "yoke will be easy," because it fits the neck of the wearer, and the haul just as easy, because the "burden" is light to the bearer. A loyal, consecrated, harnessed will; an individual allegiance that foreswears "two masters" will leave the peace of Jesus' last legacy, and the hope of the gospel to oil the wheels of the will which seeks first the kingdom of the King and the "profit" of the man who saves his soul.

3. Jesus taught that man himself is a prophecy of a Saviour. The disease demanded a cure. The hurt called for a Healer. The gospel is a logical necessity. Without a Christ, the moral world were a riddle—a maze without a cue. The first forth-teller and fore-runner of Jesus Christ was not the rough-mantled John ringing the wilderness with his call to repentance; nor yet the rapt Isaiah who saw the day of Christ from afar, as a watcher from mountain-brow sees the dawn; nor even the smoking altar-flame of Mosaic or patriarchal sacrifice; no, nor the Edenic promise of the woman's seed and of the bruised heel and head. Rather was it man himself in his essential noble nature and his clamorous need calling for an interposing God and a mediating Christ, and an atoning Redeemer.

4. Matching this latent prophecy and realizing it, is the direct Appeal of Jesus. Montepiore, speaking of publicans and sinners drawing near to Jesus, says: "Surely this is a new note, something which we have not yet heard in the Old Testament or of *its* heroes, something which we do not hear in the Talmud or of *its* heroes. The virtues of repentance are gloriously praised in the rabbinical literature, but this direct search for, and appeal to, sinners are new and moving notes of high import and significance."

Now, with a gospel for man and to man, is not this Jesus-note of appeal well nigh lost in these modern days? The pulpit message is made a signboard more than a sword. It has kept its publicity and lost its thrust. Publicans and sinners are addressed, but not drawn. They do not draw near because the Appeal is wanting.

John Keats, in his "Letters," speaks of our world as a place for making souls. "A vale of soul-making," is Keats' phrase. "Publicans and sinners" need this making. Why not press them to be made?

The ancient Persians believed that, when the soul of the good man crossed the river of death, a shining figure met him: "I am your true self—the image of your ideals, strivings, hopes, purposes. Henceforth you merge into me. We are one and the same." Now, the Jesus of the Gospel, here and now, is just such a Shining

